

REMARKS

Claim 25 has been amended to address the 112 rejection. Claims 31 and 33 have been amended to clarify the invention, and to better define the invention over the prior art. Claim 38 has been added to further scope the invention. No new matter has been entered by any of the foregoing amendments.

The objection to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) is in error. The specification, paragraph 0051, in discussing Fig. 8, specifically describes how FIG. 8 shows "The thickness of the thick-film wiring 2c and the bumps 3 are made equal..."(see in particular page 28, lines 14-15). Thus the drawings show all structural features as claimed.

Turning to the several art rejections, and considering first the rejection of claims 25-26, 29 and 30 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,836,002 to Chikawa et al (hereinafter "Chikawa") in view of US Patent Publication No. 2004/0080040 to Dotta et al (hereinafter "Dotta"), claim 25 requires, in part, "at least one voltage selected from power supply voltage and ground is fed from said interposer substrate by way of said thick-film wiring." The Examiner admits that Chikawa et al. does not expressly teach the electrical connection is at least one voltage selected from power supply and voltage and ground. Dotta teaches a stacked-chip semiconductor device connected with power supply through electrodes 8a and grounding through electrodes 8b (paragraph [0040]) from the interposer substrate 30 to the electrode pads 7 on surface of the semiconductor chips (FIG. 9) but does not teach that the power supply voltage and ground is fed by "way of said thick-film wiring." Thus because neither Chikawa, nor Dotta discloses this feature of claim 25, no combination of Chikawa and Dotta would achieve claim 25, and the rejection of claim 25 therefore is in error.

Moreover, there are other differences. Chikawa discloses that a re-wiring layer is provided on the circuit-formed surface of an IC chip 3 (col. 5, lines 2-4 and Fig. 1); that the thickness of the re-wiring layer becomes “overwhelmingly” thinner than that of an interposer (col. 6, lines 26-27); and that, as a result, an increase in the thickness of the package should be suppressed (col. 7, lines 62-64). And, Dotta discloses that through electrodes are made through a semiconductor chip 1 (paragraph [0039] and Fig. 1(b)) and that increasing the area of the through electrode is required (paragraph [0042]). Since the requirements for the re-wiring layer of Chikawa and the through electrode of Dotta are mutually exclusive, they could not readily be combined.

Claims 26, 29, and 30 depend on claim 25, and are allowable over the applied art for the same reasons above adduced relative to claim 25, as well as for their own additional limitations.

The rejection of claim 27 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chikawa in view of Dotta as applied to claim 25 above, and further in view of US Patent No. 7,132,752 to Saeki likewise is in error. Claim 27 depends on independent claim 25. The deficiencies of the combination of Chikawa and Dotta vis-à-vis claim 25 are discussed above. Saeki fails to supply the missing teachings. Thus, claim 27 also is allowable for the same reasons above adduced relative to claim 25, as well as for its own additional limitations.

Turning now to the rejection of claim 28 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chikawa in view of Dotta as applied to claim 25 above, and in further view of US Patent No. 5,481,133 to Smola, claim 28 depends on independent claim 25. The deficiencies of the Chikawa/Dotta combination vis-à-vis claim 25 are discussed above. Smola also fails to supply

HAYES SOLOWAY P.C.
3450 E. SUNRISE DRIVE,
SUITE 140
TUCSON, AZ 85718
TEL. 520.882.7623
FAX. 520.882.7643

175 CANAL STREET
MANCHESTER, NH 03101
TEL. 603.668.1400
FAX. 603.668.8567

the missing teachings. Thus, claim 28 also is allowable for the same reasons above adduced relative to claim 25, as well as for its own additional limitations.

The rejection of claim 31 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chikawa in view of Dotta and US Patent Publication 2002/0041027 to Sugizaki also is in error. Claim 31 requires, in part, a current path between the first conducting member and the second conducting member. The Examiner admits Chikawa fails to disclose the required conducting members. Dotta fails to disclose a current path between the first and second conducting members. Sugizaki also fails to disclose a current path between the first conducting member and the second conducting member where the first conducting member and the second conducting member independently feed the first and second semiconductor chip. Thus, no combination of Chikawa, Dotta and Sugizaki would achieve all of the limitations of claim 31.

Similar comments apply to the rejection of claims 32, 34 and 35-37 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chikawa and Sugizaki as applied to claim 31 above, and in further view of Dotta. Claims 32, 34, and 35-37 depend on independent claim 31. The deficiencies of the Chikawa/Sugizaki/Dotta combination vis-à-vis claim 31 are discussed above. Claims 32, 34, and 35-37 which depend directly or indirectly on claim 31 are also allowable over the Chikawa/Sugizaki/Dotta combination for the same reasons above adduced relative to claim 31, as well as for their own additional limitations.

Turning finally to the rejection of claim 33 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chikawa and Sugizaki as applied to claim 31 above, and in view of Dotta, and further in view of Smola, claim 33 depends on independent claim 31. The deficiencies of the Chikawa/Sugizaki/Dotta combination vis-à-vis claim 31 are discussed above. Smola fails to

HAYES SOLOWAY P.C.
3450 E. SUNRISE DRIVE,
SUITE 140
TUCSON, AZ 85718
TEL. 520.882.7623
FAX. 520.882.7643

175 CANAL STREET
MANCHESTER, NH 03101
TEL. 603.668.1400
FAX. 603.668.8567

overcome these deficiencies. Thus, no combination of Chikawa, Sugizaki, Dotta and Smola could achieve or render obvious claim 31, or claim 33 which depends thereon.

Having dealt with all the objections raised by the Examiner, the Application is believed to be in order for allowance. Early and favorable action is respectfully requested.

In the event there are any fee deficiencies or additional fees are payable, please charge them (or credit any overpayment) to our Deposit Account Number 08-1391.

Respectfully submitted,



Norman P. Soloway
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 24,315

Customer No. 27,667

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Patent Office via the electronic filing procedure on April 3, 2009.

By: 

NPS/TAS:kls:ru:ps:sm

HAYES SOLOWAY P.C.
3450 E. SUNRISE DRIVE,
SUITE 140
TUCSON, AZ 85718
TEL. 520.882.7623
FAX. 520.882.7643

175 CANAL STREET
MANCHESTER, NH 03101
TEL. 603.668.1400
FAX. 603.668.8567